

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 are pending in this case. Claims 1 and 12 are amended by the present amendment with support in the originally filed disclosure at least at Fig. 1 and at paragraph [0065] of the published Specification. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 12, and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kurita, in view of Ala-Luukko, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,934,285 B1, herein “Ala-Luukko”); Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kurita, in view of Ala-Luukko, further in view of Maufer, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,120,930 B2, herein “Maufer”); Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kurita, in view of Ala-Luukko and Maufer, further in view of Ogawa, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,653 B1, herein “Ogawa”); and Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kurita, in view of Ala-Luukko, further in view of Angwin, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,450, herein “Angwin”).

Applicants respectfully request that the IDSs filed on June 9, 2008 and on June 30, 2008 be considered by the examiner and indicated as such in the next Office Action.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the claims.

The outstanding Office Action asserts, at pages 3 and 4, that Kurita teaches every element of Claim 1 except “a plurality of service types with rules or policies relating to the service types and specifying processing of a service request signal,” which it asserts Ala-Luukko as teaching.

However, amended Claim 1 clarifies that the control information is “generated by a service management device connected to the service control device.” As is clear from Fig. 1 of Kurita, the mobile service control point 9, which is asserted to teach the service control

device as defined by Claim 1, is not connected to anything other than the gateway server 5, which is asserted to teach the gateway device as defined by Claim 1. Thus, Kurita does not teach or suggest control information “generated by a service management device connected to the service control device,” because Kurita does not teach a service management device, as defined by amended Claim 1, at all.

Ala-Luukko does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Kurita. Further, Ala-Luukko does not cure the deficiencies conceded for Kurita with regard to “control information including rules or policies defined for each of the plurality of services,” as recited by Claim 1.

Ala-Luukko describes a method and system for modification of intelligent network parameters. As described at columns 1 and 2 of Ala-Luukko, a terminal device connected to a second telecommunication network can be used to send a fixed-format message to modify a service data parameter and/or service logic of the intelligent network. The gateway connecting the second telecommunication network to the service logic of the service control point SCP and/or to the service data point SDP uses a table to convert the fixed-format message of the second telecommunications network to a message format supported by the intelligent network. The SCP indicates, by a number indicating one among a list in the gateway, for example, the type of message being transmitted to the second telecommunication network.

However, the indicator indicated by the SCP of Ala-Luukko does not teach or suggest “control information...including rules or policies defined for each of the plurality of services” as defined by Claim 1. First, as described at column 5, lines 1-12, the indicator only indicates a position on a list in the gateway. More significantly, even if, *arguendo*, an indicator indicating a position on a list teaches rules or policies, those rules or policies would not be

“defined for each of the plurality of services,” as defined by Claim 1. Instead, each indicator would only relate to a single message type.

Additionally, the fixed-format message sent by the second telecommunications network of Ala-Luukko and received by the gateway does not include “rules or policies” but, rather, service logic or service parameters to change the services available to the terminal device. Thus, the fixed-format message described by Ala-Luukko does not teach or suggest control information as defined by Claim 1.

Finally, the list referred to by the outstanding Office Action, defining the type of message being transmitted, not only fails to teach or suggest a control information as defined by Claim 1 but is also not “received” by the gateway but, rather, is described as “a list in the gateway,” as column 5, line 7, of Ala-Luukko.

Because Kurita and Ala-Luukko, even in combination, do not teach or suggest at least the above-discussed features of amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claim 1 and Claims 2-5, 8, 9, and 13, which depend therefrom, be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 7, 10, and 11 depend from Claim 1 and, therefore, patentably define over Kurita and Ala-Luukko for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. Further, Maufer, which is additionally asserted against Claim 6; the combination of Maufer and Ogawa, which is additionally asserted against Claim 7; and Angwin, which is additionally asserted against Claims 10 and 11, do not cure the deficiencies of Kurita and Ala-Luukko with regard to Claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of Claims 6, 7, 10, and 11 be withdrawn.

Amended Claim 12 is directed to a method of processing a signal in a gateway device and includes, *inter alia*, “receiving...**control information**...from the service control device, the control information being **generated by a service management device connected to the**


service control device and including rules or policies defined for each of the plurality of services.”

Thus, Claim 12 patentably defines over Kurita and Ala-Luukko for similar reasons as discussed above with regard to Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Usha M. Parker
Registration No. 61,939

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

I:\ATTY\UMP\26's\263485US\263485US AMND3-2.DOC